



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

MARCH, 1915

## A LETTER TO "THE TIMES"

BY THE EDITOR

*My Dear Lord Northcliffe:*

I HAVE had it in mind for some weeks to avail myself of the time-honored privilege of addressing a communication to *The Times* upon a subject of very great and perhaps really vital importance to our respective countries, but now when the time has come to do so I feel that I may be able to express what I have to say more readily and more clearly if I write with less formality directly to you as an old and valued friend. I am the freer to do this because, as you will recall, it fell to my lot in the course of a dinner given in your honor some years ago to make the first public announcement of your prospective assumption of control of the great journal which has thrived so amazingly under your direction. Then, too, you really know and understand America as I have had at least opportunity to know and understand England—a circumstance of no small importance in an undertaking whose merit is full sincerity and whose chief requisite is perfect candor.

Let me ask you this: Am I wrong in concluding from close observation and anxious inquiry that at this most critical of times in all history, when as never before our respective peoples should be animated by the most fraternal spirit, they are gradually but surely drawing asunder? If not, if my perception is true, then manifestly a condition has developed insensibly

which not only gives rise to concern no less grave than that caused by the great war itself, but should be recognized and met squarely, frankly, and intelligently by those of us on both sides of the water who appreciate the peril of such misunderstanding.

My fear is that I am right with respect especially to your people, among whom I seem to perceive a growing sense of personal injury which is rapidly assuming the proportions of common resentment. That such a feeling should pervade to a degree the hearts of men and women living in frightful stress was perhaps to be expected; much allowance must be made when souls are being tried; no appreciable harm ensues, moreover, so long as considerations of prudence enjoin the silence of forbearance; but when open manifestations of hidden hurt begin to appear with increasing frequency and vehemence the circumstance is one not to be ignored.

Is not that the present situation? Of all British public journals, none in the past twenty years has been more considerate and appreciative of the United States than the *Spectator*, now suddenly become for the first time both apprehensive and truculent. "A Great Danger" is the quite unusual and somewhat startling title under which it informs us that "Englishmen who admire and love America cannot help feeling acute anxiety and alarm at the way in which we are drifting toward the danger of a collision with the United States." But what are the prospective causes? The *Spectator* cites but one—the "commercial intrigue under which the *Dacia* has been bought and set sailing," thus "first providing our enemies with a million or two of ready cash and then employing the former German mercantile marine to supply the commercial needs of our enemies under the protection of the American national flag"—an act which President Wilson may or may not "be able to convince his countrymen" is unfriendly. But, it continues, "what we are much more concerned about than these specific plans for bending the neutrality of America in such a way as will bring material aid to Germany is the want of understanding of the situation, both material and moral, which is shown by the American Government and by large sections of the American people. . . . They think that because we are in a tight place they can ask things from us which they would not have asked in peace, and that we must yield to necessity." Pronouncing "exactly the contrary" to be true, the *Spectator* proceeds:

Rightly or wrongly, we are certain that this is the case. Take the attitude of the *Spectator* as an example. We have always felt in peace-

time that in squabbles with America anything was better than to make bad blood between the two countries, and we have always been anxious to show the utmost consideration to America—to yield wherever possible to her demands. We are free to confess that this cannot now be our attitude. The temper of stern determination, which is the only temper compatible with success in war, prevents us, and must inevitably prevent us, from adopting the old easy-going methods. Strive as we will, we cannot help feeling deeply, and resenting deeply, the indifference, or indeed callousness, toward Great Britain and her case shown by the Government of the United States. Here is the danger. Their attitude is one of calmness, of friendly calmness if you will, but of calmness. They expect what they would call a reasonable give and take, prudent concessions, and a just appreciation of their own difficulties. They do not in the least realize that it is foolish to ask a man engaged in a death struggle to remember that when one is in a tight place it is wise to make concessions to one's neighbors. They do not understand that in war-time business-like views of this kind do not appeal to us in the least.

A yet worse danger is "the growing soreness and disappointment felt by the British people in regard to the attitude of the American Government" which "causes deep resentment here, even amongst those who, like ourselves, were so pro-American in their sympathies that six months ago satirists were inclined to tell them that they imagined America could do no wrong." It is "a feeling of bitterness" and "every word of it stings like a whip on our ears." America "in effect claims the right to provide Germany with the means of holding down Belgium and killing English soldiers, and freely to supply the material required for bombs to slay non-combatants. Can it be wondered at that, even though it may be unreasonable, and though, of course, we ought to see the American case and so forth, we feel cut to the heart that America seems to reckon up the matter in cold dollars and cents rather than in terms of flesh and blood and of human suffering?"

"If the Washington Government," the *Spectator* concludes, menacingly, "think our difficulties will make us more compliant than in peace-time, they are very much mistaken. We would endure harsh treatment from them in peace-time far more easily than we can endure it now. That is foolish, perhaps, but it is a fact."

The *Outlook* goes a step further when it declares that "the United States of America seek to outrage neutrality while remaining a neutral" by purchasing German ships in which to convey products to Germany and so becoming "the supporter

of those who are marching through broken treaties and the shattered traditions of humanity toward their goal of universal military dominion."

"It would be hard," the *Outlook* continues, "to find in history any instance of a greater or a more deadly outrage upon all international law and precedent than that involved in the measure proposed by President Wilson. The miserable consequences of setting an amiable doctrinaire to deal with great practical affairs were perhaps never more plainly shown. President Wilson has talked much of the abstract principles of justice and of right. He has prated of arbitration and of the brutality of war. But now, when the test has come, he has fallen to the bottom of the very pit of evils against which in many rounded periods he has warned mankind. He has allowed himself to be made the tool, the dupe, at once of those of his fellow-citizens whose sole concern is to make money out of the agony of half mankind, and of German agents whose single business is to create trouble for the Allies."

The *Outlook* concludes by proposing in these words a drastic method of meeting the situation:

Let our Cabinet decline absolutely to discuss this subject any further with the United States except in association with our principal friends, amongst whom Japan has an important place, for Japan also has deep interest in the duration of the strife, and as a sea Power has a right to be consulted. If this course were but adopted by our Government the whole position would speedily change. The answer to the Republic would be given in the names of four Empires. Its demands would be shown plainly, though in the most courteous language of diplomacy, to be substantially demands for the blood of their men and for uncounted millions of their money. What would follow? The United States protests would be heard of no more. For the United States do not really want to declare war on Japan and on Russia, on France and on Britain, in defense of an outrageous violation of the law of nations perpetrated at the instigation of Teutonic murderers.

What is the meaning of all this? Surely no warrant for such savage denunciation and startling proposals can be found in the specific acts complained of. Mr. Strachey in the *Spectator* incidentally, though perhaps unwittingly, concedes that the *Dacia* case is a mere test of a general regulation which Great Britain is wholly at liberty to enforce or not as she pleases. Of itself it is quite trivial and unprovocative. With regard to the shipping of foodstuffs to Germany, it need only be said that our

Government courteously inquired of your Foreign Office if it would be considered objectionable, and received a correspondingly courteous response to the effect that such shipments were permissible if made to individuals. In any case, the German Government had disposed of the matter before the *Outlook* protested so violently by decreeing confiscation of all such products.

Justification for the most serious charge—namely, that of purchase and operation of interned German ships by the United States Government, contrary to custom and in doubtful faith, may be readily conceded. But objection to this procedure was not restricted to the British. The American press and the American people were equally determined in opposition and the responsive American Congress killed the measure in the face of the President's most hardy insistence; so that, however unfavorably the action of the Executive may be regarded, surely no complaint can lie against the Government as a whole.

Can it be possible, my dear Northcliffe, that the wise, prudent and far-seeing Strachey whom I have known would reverse the attitude of a lifetime and threaten us with war, and that Mr. Wyatt would seriously urge inciting Japan against us upon pretexts so flimsy and untenable as these? That to my mind is inconceivable. The cause lies deeper in the heart of the English nation, and there lurks the real danger.

The "bitterness" to which Mr. Strachey alludes, and which, as I have already observed with deep regret, seems to be increasing, springs, I take it, from a sense of disappointment at the official conduct of our Government. This is readily understood. When the German Chancellor tore the famous scrap of paper to bits, and the mighty German army hurled itself upon brave little Belgium in ruthless violation of plighted faith and national honor, the wave of indignation which swept over this country equaled, if, indeed, it did not exceed in intensity that which drove your nation instantly to arms. This fact, so emphatically manifested by the American press, naturally induced in the minds of your people not merely a hope, but a settled expectation that our Government as a Government would at least voice the feeling thus expressed with promptness and vigor, and would avail itself of every opportunity to extend material aid to the allied forces. While there was no anticipation or desire that the United States should treat Germany's shocking conduct as a cause for open warfare, and while our declaration of neutrality was readily accepted as both justifiable and proper,

it was felt and believed that at a suitable moment our Government, officially and perhaps even in a practical manner, would exemplify the sympathy already expressed with such unanimity by our people.

It was inevitable, then, and not, I am frank to say, without some basis of reason, that the English people should have been surprised when our Government declined to protest under the terms of the Hague Convention, even though it was under no technical obligation to do so; when it refrained from denouncing the wanton destruction of cathedrals and other architectural monuments; when it refused to heed accounts of atrocities committed; and when subsequently it took no cognizance of indiscriminate killing of unarmed and inoffensive residents of unfortified places. As you are doubtless aware, this frustration of hopes in England found a very considerable response in America at the instigation—obviously for political purposes, be it noted—of Mr. Roosevelt, but I believe that I am quite within bounds in saying that the great majority of our people approved the course pursued by President Wilson, upon the theory that any seeming infraction of our professed neutrality, in itself of no practical effect, might subsequently operate to rob our Government of opportunities to render real service to those whom we would befriend and whose success we ardently desired then, as we do even more strongly now. Your Government apparently understood this, else they would have indicated in some way their dissatisfaction; but your people clearly did not and do not now—a most regrettable circumstance, for which, as it seems to me, nobody can be justly blamed.

But it is not my purpose to defend or to decri the conduct of our Government. That must stand or fall, in the judgment of all fair minds, upon its merits. What I aim to do, so far as I am able, and what I hope you will see fit to do with your unexampled facilities, is to clear away the mists of perilous misunderstanding by making clear to your people the real attitude of ours, and by setting forth the underlying causes which, I beg you to believe, have constituted us at least your moral ally.

When Mr. Strachey instances some specific performance on the part of our Government as evidencing wilful lack of appreciation of the situation, lack of knowledge of what England is fighting for, and lack of accord with her definite aims, I can follow him without difficulty, but when he declares as a fact that such "want of understanding" is not only shared, but "shown" by "large sections of the American people," I am utterly bewildered.

My dear Northcliffe, there are no such antagonistic sections among our people. There is not a solitary one that can be pronounced "large" except in arrogance, in impudence, and in the growing disfavor of their fellow-countrymen.

Mr. Strachey declares with marked positiveness that the United States "are asking us to fight with one hand tied behind our back in order to enable the State Department and the Administration generally not to disappoint Herr Dernburg," and dwells upon "the pressure of the German vote." Passing for a moment the *Spectator's* hardly warranted inference respecting President Wilson's disposition toward Dr. Dernburg and other intermeddlers—although he has made it sufficiently plain upon more than one occasion—what about this terrifying "German vote"? What does it amount to? At the latest National election 15,000,000 of ballots were cast. Of these about 500,000 were deposited by naturalized citizens of German birth and approximately 1,500,000 by citizens of German descent born in this country—a total of perhaps 2,000,000 out of 15,000,000. Some voted for Wilson, some for Taft, some for Roosevelt, and not a few for Debs, but *all* voted against their *bête noire*, Prohibition; and will again, regardless of other considerations—a fact which I beg you to bear in mind.

Now it is undoubtedly the purpose of our visiting instructor in politics and morals, Dr. Dernburg, and his well-paid helpers to foment trouble between America and England. That, of course, is their privilege. Probably England would not go out of her way to prevent the arising of a difficulty between the United States and Germany. But how are they progressing? That is the question. Their first endeavor was to "educate public opinion" and they published many articles and addressed many assemblages, but wholly without avail. Although ready and willing to accord them a fair hearing, the public could not be convinced—and even Mr. Herman Ridder's blatant diatribes soon disappeared from the columns of all newspapers except his own.

Public opinion having politely but firmly refused to be "educated" to worship of "the law of necessity" as "inevitable" and altogether righteous, Herr Dernburg and associates resorted naturally to their traditional and more familiar argument—Force. With a blundering incapacity paralleled in recent times only by the German Chancellor's bulldozing "diplomacy" in his dealings with Sir Edward Grey, they determined to terrorize all political parties, beginning with that of President Wilson,



whom, incidentally, they have traduced unconscionably, to the verge of treason, in their public speeches.

These extraordinary and largely subsidized efforts culminated in a "convention" at Washington of fifty-eight "German" or, as they are coming to be more commonly and jeeringly termed, "hyphenated" Americans, who stupidly—

*Resolved*, That we citizens of the United States agree to effect a national organization, the objects and purposes of which may be stated as follows:

(1) In order to assume the possession of an independent news service, we favor an American cable, controlled by the Government of the United States.

(2) We demand a free and open sea for the commerce of the United States and unrestricted traffic in non-contraband goods as defined by international law.

(3) We favor as a strictly American policy the immediate enactment of legislation prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war.

(4) We favor the establishment of an American merchant marine, and

(5) We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country and who will aid in eliminating all undue foreign influences from American life.

Doubtless you have been apprised of the effect of this exhibition of intolerable insolence. The *Literary Digest* sums it up neatly:

"The wickedness of the scheme lies in its purpose to create friction between England and the United States," declares the Boston *Transcript*. The men behind the movement, says the Springfield *Republican*, reveal themselves as "more German than American," and the New York *Times* is convinced that "never since the foundation of the Republic has any body of men assembled here who were more completely subservient to a foreign Power and to foreign influence, and none ever proclaimed the un-American spirit more openly." "The sole object of the promoters of this movement is to drive the United States from its present position of neutrality," affirms the New York *Herald*. The position they ask us to abandon, says the New York *Sun*, is "historically, legally, and morally correct," while the course they urge upon us amounts virtually to "the enlistment of the American people under the flag of Germany." These men, declares the New York *World*, "are doing Germany no good, and themselves much harm, by their pernicious pro-German propaganda." The movement, in the opinion of the Philadelphia *Ledger*, represents "a pro-German

plot," and the Brooklyn *Eagle* suggests that the activities of its promoters bear a close resemblance to treason.

Not one public journal printed in English had a kindly or respectful word to say of this grotesque performance, not one; and yet more significant was the sharp denunciation of the movement by the New York *Volkszeitung* as "a dangerous agitation, seeking, under the hypocritical pretense of preserving America's neutrality, to destroy it," and calling upon "every German-American workingman in the country" to oppose it "with all his strength." The growing revolt among Americans of German descent was emphasized further by Dr. Kuno Francke of Harvard, who, after declaring his sympathies "fervently on the German side," wrote:

We have every opportunity in this country to make felt what is best in German character and life. Let us continue to do so; let us continue to have a prominent part in all endeavors for political, civic, and industrial progress; let us stand for the German ideals of honesty, loyalty, truthfulness, devotion to work; let us cultivate our language, our literature, and our art; let us fearlessly defend the cause of our mother-country against prejudices and aspersions. But let us refrain from political organizations which would set Germans in this country apart as a class by themselves. Such an attempt would lead not to the raising, but to the degradation, of the German name in this country. It would foster hatred instead of sympathy; and only by gaining the sympathy of the majority of the American people can we German-Americans help the cause of our mother-country.

The simple fact is that the German agents overreached and are hoist by their own petard. So far from successfully intimidating political aspirants, they have made it dangerous for a public man to speak a word in favor of their cause—and, incidentally, none of importance, to my knowledge, has done so. It is, moreover, quite evident upon all sides that the younger men of German descent who constitute the great bulk of the two millions of voters no longer find the term "German-American" palatable. Quite after our American fashion, the happy suggestion of "hyphenated" has changed the style. The ridiculous assertion that "Irish-Americans," who really no longer appreciably exist, have joined hands with "German-Americans" for political purposes under Herr Dernburg's leadership finds sufficient answer in the mere fact that the Shipping Bill so ardently desired by German owners and bankers was defeated through the exertions of Senator James A. O'Gorman, a Tam-

many Democrat and the foremost statesman of Irish extraction now in American public life.

So much for "the pressure of the German vote"—less than one-seventh of the total, whose inconceivable unification would serve only to arouse an opposition that would deprive it of any measure of effectiveness even in domestic affairs. Do not you think that in the circumstances Mr. Strachey might be induced to revise his intimation of subserviency on President Wilson's part to a power which does not and could not exist except to its own immediate undoing?

The matter of "commercialism" as an accusation against our people, to my mind, calls for no more than passing attention, despite the *Spectator's* stinging remark that "America seems to reckon it up in cold dollars and cents rather than in terms of flesh and blood and of human suffering." It is true, of course, that we wish to maintain our trade relations with other neutral countries in strict conformity with international usage in times of war. Why not? We, like you, are normally producers, manufacturers, and exporters, and the very life of a vast number of our great population is dependent upon our foreign markets.

And we are paying our full share of the cost of a war for the waging of which we surely are in no sense or degree responsible. Do you know that the number of unemployed in the United States to-day—some say it reaches five millions—is larger than ever before in our history, that thousands stand daily and nightly upon the many "bread lines" in our great cities, that practically all of our industrial establishments, except those engaged in producing essentials chiefly for England and France, are running on little better than "half time," that enforced stoppage of the payment of dividends upon widely distributed shares of concerns like the Steel Corporation has plunged scores of thousands of families into comparative want, that the entire South lies prostrate and helpless under the mountain of its unsaleable cotton? And yet, despite this distressful condition, hardly appreciated, naturally, by your people in the midst of their own sufferings, has not America poured into Belgium and Holland and France ten millions to England's one? Is it quite fair, I ask, in view of all this, to pronounce us selfish, greedy, and insensible to human woes?

It is not, I beg you to believe, my dear Northcliffe, either because of our desire to lend aid and comfort to the enemies of civilization or of our craving for material gains that we

should like to send food to Germany as we are sending it in great quantities to Belgium and Holland without money or price; it is because we would, if we could, save from starvation the poor German people whom, too, we love. Is there anything reprehensible in that? Surely Mr. Strachey would not propose, as has been proposed here, that the United States establish a general embargo. What then would become of the forty millions of English who look to this great granary for their necessities of life?

I wonder, moreover, if your people, in common with your Government and, of course, yourself, are fully aware that their allied forces are drawing their rifles, their cartridges, and other munitions of war from our factories, and that, but for the supply thus obtained, they could hardly hope *ever* to triumph. As you doubtless know, a determined effort made in Congress, under "pressure of the German vote," to stop the sale of implements of destruction to combatants got not so much as a hearing. Why? Because "America seems to reckon the matter in cold dollars and cents rather than in terms of flesh and blood and of human suffering"? Perhaps, though I do not admit it. But even so, would not the savage intimation come with better grace from the *Hamburger Zeitung*, let us say, than from the *Spectator*?

Yes, we wish to sell our cotton even to Germans and Austrians, though Britain can easily prevent our doing so and without evoking protest from us if she should consider such action necessary or desirable. But there is nothing new in that. Who was it, when we were fighting for our national life as England is fighting for hers to-day, that said "calmly"—if I may use the *Spectator's* reprehending term—"assuredly we are opposed to human slavery, *but we want cotton*"; who, if not a British statesman? And did not practically all England, including even Mr. Gladstone, who ostentatiously purchased Confederate bonds, act accordingly? Our reckoning in cold dollars and cents, if such it be, is at least to your advantage; yours bore encouragement to the foes of the Union. But I would not dwell unduly upon a regrettable circumstance long since atoned for and pardoned. I would not even mention it but for the appositeness which may tend to the cultivation of a more tolerant attitude on the part of some of the spokesmen for your people. But forgiving is not necessarily forgetting.

Time was not so many years ago when England was smugly arrogant and America was boyishly boastful; but now, com-

pared with the Germans, you are positively shy, and we—well, we have grown up, not perhaps to the keenest perspective, but at least to sober realization of things as they are. You know that; you know that we shed our swaddling-clothes long ago and are to-day as unemotional as those steady folk of France who are fighting sturdily for their liberties and their homes as a simple matter of course without a murmur; but are your countrymen possessed of the knowledge which you have derived from personal acquaintance and observation? I am not so sure. Else how *could* representative journals like the *Spectator* and the *Outlook* ignore such evidences of fealty and friendliness as have been manifested no less strongly by the American women of America than by the American-born women of England; how *can* they fail to grasp the import of the greatest *American* banking-house becoming the avowed fiscal and purchasing agent of Britain without evoking a word of disapprobation from any part of our country; how *can* they be so blind as to perceive no significance in the refusal of an American President to participate in a celebration in honor of a revolutionary hero lest his neutrality be questioned? “So,” caustically remarks *Punch*, “water is thicker than blood, after all.” Is it true? Have not I adduced indications to the contrary sufficient to satisfy any fair mind?

No, no; believe that I know when I say to you that, while as a nation we are neutral, as we should be for your account no less than for our own, as a people we are in this crucial contest heart and soul with the people of England, the people of France, and—yes, by all means and with yet greater emphasis, with the people of Germany.

But we must abide no illusions if we would clear away misunderstandings; so let me tell you why we are “with the Allies.” It is not because of ties of kinship as between nations; not at all. We do not consider that the United States as a political entity is in debt to England; quite the contrary, we should have said as late as half a century ago; and even now, when William Watson, poet, curses “craven daughter” for not rushing to the defense of “noble mother,” we have to laugh, though not, of course, to scorn. Neither to France, though ever friendly, nor to Russia, though everlastingly grateful, does the United States acknowledge obligations of such a nature as to impel embroilment in causes not her own. Moreover, as a people, we have quite as much in common with the thrifty, industrious, home-loving Germans as with English, French, or Russians;

that, in view especially of the high quality of their contribution to our citizenry, is but natural.

But can we and do we condone brutality in warfare such as that which devastated Belgium? Of course not; and yet to what extent is "all fair" in war? We simply do not know. Does anybody? If the English, French, and Russian delegates to The Hague had supported the proposition of our representatives to make all nations responsible for the observance by each of accepted regulations, there would have been created at least a basis for protest or even action. As it is, the hell which is war continues to have no standards of conduct.

The Kaiser? To be blamed, no doubt, but in reason and rather primarily to be pitied as the chief victim of a false and infamous, though honestly held, doctrine. Do you happen to know that the first outburst against the Emperor here came in no small part from Americans of German birth and descent? It is a fact—a fact, to my mind, of marked significance.

Why, then, are we for you and your Allies? For no other reason in the world except that you are continuing the great battle for government of, for, and by the people which we began when at Lexington we fired the shot that was heard around the world,—for the glorious cause that Franklin, and Jefferson, and Madison wrote for, that Patrick Henry spoke for, that Washington and Jackson fought for, that Lincoln died for, that McKinley suffered for, that every American statesman worthy of the title now lives for. As I have remarked already, and as none better than you well knows, we are no longer in the kindergarten, as the *Spectator* and the *Outlook* seem to think, to be treated condescendingly, to be patronized, even to be taught our responsibilities and duties; we are full grown and, if I may say so without giving offense, which I wish not to do, we have come to have a clearer comprehension of what this dreadful affair is about than you seem to have. Your people are so close to it, so menaced by it, that inevitably their perspective is dimmed. Our view is truer because it is comparatively far removed and is formed by our most competent minds. President Emeritus Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard University, with the indomitable spirit of undying fervor, leaped early to a conclusion which proved to be correct. President Arthur T. Hadley, of Yale, on the other hand, compelled to speak, if at all, of his acquaintances, associates, and friends in Berlin, "took his time"; but when he had taken his time he said:

At the outbreak of the present war people who were unacquainted with Germany thought that it was the work of the Emperor and those about him. They believed that the nation was less eager for war than the court, and that the scholars and men of science at the universities might be trusted to moderate the feelings of the nation. It soon appeared that this was a mistaken conception. The nation was apparently much more eager for war than the Emperor. The universities acted as exponents of the national feeling. Instead of trying to moderate the zeal for war, they championed it as their own.

It is characteristic of modern Germany that the universities should be exponents rather than critics of public sentiment. For the universities are probably in closer touch with public opinion in Germany than in any other country and do more to make that public opinion. The contact of professors and students with the national problems is more direct, and their influence on national feeling as a whole much stronger than is the case either in England or in America.

The German universities do more than prepare the great body of officeholders for their work. They do much in preparing the public sentiment that is behind these officeholders. In America and in England the organization of public opinion is largely in the hands of the newspapers, and particularly of the daily newspapers. In Germany the case is quite different. A position as editor of a daily paper in Germany does not carry social and political influence with it. The editor is generally expected to be the mouthpiece of somebody else. The political news that he gives is limited. The political opinions which he utters carry little weight. The magazines have more independence and more influence than the newspapers; but the real places where facts are proclaimed and opinions formed are the lecture-rooms of the universities.

The German public looks to professors for its opinions in a good deal the same way that the American public looks to journalists for its opinions. The great movements of German political thought have originated in lecture-rooms. It was there that State socialism started. It was there that the idea of German unity was most effectively championed. It was there that the doctrines now called by the name Pan-Germanism first took strong hold on the thoughts and hearts of men.

Now that is our understanding. We take rather lightly the mere interpretations of a Bernhardi; we advert with sure instinct to the philosophy of a Treitschke; and what do we find? That the awful war which is commonly regarded as between oligarchical Germany and democratic England is really between a self-constituted *State* and a God-made *people*, and that all principle, all religion, all morals, major and minor, are weighing in the balance. But—

What constitutes a State?

Men who their duties know,  
But know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain?

So the English poet sang; so the Americans believe; but what says the guide of Germany? This:

States do not arise out of the people's sovereignty, but they are created *against the will of the people*; the State is the power of the stronger race which establishes itself.

There is the crux of the matter as we have slowly but with a sense of surety come to perceive it. Might over right? Of course. But more than that, much more; nothing less, in fact, than justification of any and every evil, wrongful, or immoral act. Is a treaty to be violated? Why not? asks Treitschke:

If an unscrupulous speculator lies on the Stock Exchange he thinks only of his purse; but a diplomatist thinks of his country if during a political negotiation he becomes guilty of an obscuration of facts. The moral danger that is nearest to the diplomatist does not lie in mendacity, but in the spiritual shallowness that is born of the elegant life of the salon.

Thus it follows from this that we must distinguish between public and private morality. The order of rank of the various duties must necessarily be for the State, as it is power, quite other than for individual men. A whole series of these duties, which are obligatory on the individual, are not to be thought of in any case for the State. To maintain itself counts for it always as the highest commandment; that is absolutely moral for it. And on that account we must declare that of all political sins that of weakness is the most reprehensible and the most contemptible; it is in politics the sin against the Holy Ghost. . . .

Thus every State reserves to itself the right to decide upon its treaty obligations, and here the historian cannot make a merely formal standard suffice. He must ask the deeper question: whether the unconditioned duty of self-preservation does not justify the State. There are, unfortunately, numberless cases in the life of the State in which the employment of perfectly pure means is impossible.

Is it a matter of might?

In the further course of history, among all forces that we know, war is the mightiest and most efficient molder of nations. Only in war does a nation become a nation, and the expansion of existing States proceeds in most cases by the way of conquest, even if afterward the results of the armed combat are recognized by treaty.

Is it a question of race?



He who is baptized a Christian cannot be looked upon as a Jew; every legislature must insist on that. So far I see absolutely only one means that we can employ here: real energy of our national pride, which must become a second nature with us, so that we involuntarily reject everything that is strange to the Germanic nature. That holds good of all and sundry; it holds good visiting of theaters and music-halls as well as of newspaper-reading. Where there is Jewish filth soiling our life the German must turn away, and he must accustom himself to speak the truth straight out.

Is "nobility" concerned?

In a certain sense we must say that no country in the world has so illustrious a nobility as we have. That the order of German princes is, properly speaking, only a high order of nobility has been evident since we have had an empire. This nobility need fear no comparison. The lower order of nobility is monarchic—that part of it which is worth anything. That is why the Prussian nobility stands so high morally; these very Prussian Junkers of ill repute are the best elements of the German nobility. Every one who is at home in the small German States knows that. In Prussia the Junkers have so long been obliged to learn to be subjects that they find their glory in the service of the Crown. They had first to be humbled by the royal power, but after that they accommodated themselves to circumstances. The families of small nobles, on the contrary, in Saxony and Bavaria have always had something of the parasite about them; they wish to rise by means of the Court like the French Court-nobles.

Or the "common" people?

Necessity and sweat in daily life are the most real things for these masses who work with their hands. They wish to be in a tolerable position economically; the ideal energies, of which they are capable, exhibit themselves in two directions: in a profound religious sentiment and, on the other hand, in delight in military heroism. Who can picture to himself Jesus or Martin Luther otherwise than as the children of poor parents? Such religious geniuses only arise in the lowest ranks of society. The aristocrat must use violence upon his accustomed views of life in order to come round to the view that we are all God's children.

Or defenders of homes?

Of humanity in warfare, the well-known aphorism holds good in theory everywhere, in practice, of course, only in land warfare, that it is States and not their individual citizens that make war on one another. If the soldier does not know whom he has to look upon as soldiers in the enemy's country, whom as robbers and waylayers, then he must become cruel and unfeeling. He alone can be looked upon as a soldier who has sworn the oath of fidelity to the colors, stands

under the articles of war, and can be recognized by some distinguishing mark, which need not be a complete uniform. Ruthless severity against the franc-tireurs who swarm round the enemy without standing under the articles of war is self-evident.

Or contemned observers of a Sabbath day?

. . . In democracies a rigid denominationalism is the rule, and for domestic life in North America this denominational narrow-mindedness is in fact a real blessing. Here the Sabbath in its ghastly form is really necessary. To our German sentiment nothing is more horrible than such a day of rest, of complete inactivity, every week. We incline to the opposite fault, to a Sunday of dissipation; a stricter celebration of the Sunday can do no harm in Germany. But God preserve us from the English-American Sabbath! One must have completely exhausted oneself in every muscle and nerve for the past six days, in order to feel that this absolute laziness on the seventh day is a release. The severe and rigid, altogether narrow-minded ecclesiasticism of the Americans, which is so repulsive to us more liberal Germans, is thus shown to be a practical necessity. We come to recognize that democracy must in any case rest upon the foundation of a very strong religious morality, if it is not to get quite out of control.

Or religion generally?

If we look at matters in this way, it is evident, that the world of religious sentiment is so entirely separated from the raw atmosphere of the life of the State, that a full understanding can never supervene here. Religious truths are truths of the mind, true as nothing else is for the believing, but altogether non-existent for the unbelieving. Childhood, which lives for the future, and old age with its quiet contemplativeness are especially accessible to the promises of religion; to the female mind, also, the profound unrest of an existence without religion is unbearable. In the life of the State, however, it is above all the men who decide; they are the rulers here. The State is guided not by emotions, but by calculating, clear experience of the world; religion wishes to know only what it believes, the State to believe only what it knows. In the ecclesiastical community the subjective conviction of the believing conscience is, simply, everything. The ideal of a religious fellowship is the republic. Its constitution must be so framed that the changing conviction of the community may find expression: thus in this case again the Evangelical Church stands above the Catholic. It is the other way about in the State. It is in the first instance power; and undoubtedly its ideal is the monarchy, because in it the power of the State expresses itself in an especially decided and consistent way.

And, finally, war and murders?

We have learned to know the moral majesty of war in the very thing that appears brutal and inhuman to superficial observers. That one must overcome the natural feelings of humanity for the sake of the fatherland, that in this case men murder one another who have never harmed one another before and who perhaps esteem one another highly as chivalrous enemies, that is at the first glance the awfulness of war, but at the same time its greatness also. A man must sacrifice not only his life, but he must yield up his whole ego to a great patriotic idea: that is the moral exaltedness of war.

Our German visitors declare half-heartedly that this shocking doctrine does not constitute their real creed, but as one after another the shameful acts authorized by their State, or General Staff as it is now known, have conformed to it literally, we can see no reason for doubting the correctness of President Hadley's analysis. To our minds, then, the real issue is not, as your people seem to think, mere militarism; it is the hideous conception of which militarism is but one of many manifestations; it is despotism itself; the despotism which united our people originally in armed resistance and which is no less hateful to us now than it was then.

Neutral? Yes, in the name of the nation, but not in our heart of hearts. We are for the England which has been gradually freeing the world while Germany has been planning to enslave it. No one of the great colonies which owe her so much and are responding so nobly to her call is more true to the glorious aspiration for which now she is giving her life-blood than these United States. Gradually and gropingly, I admit, but assuredly at last we have attained a realization and understanding which at the moment of effectiveness will render it impossible for any titular Government to fail to do its full part.

Meanwhile, I beg of you, my dear Northcliffe, to maintain unceasingly the patient and wise consideration which you have breathed into your great journals while I transmit to Mr. Strachey a small volume whose sole merit is its title: *The Power of Tolerance*. I am, as ever,

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE HARVEY.

### MAKING FREE WITH THE FLAG

MUCH comment pro and contra has been aroused by the action of various British steamship captains in substituting the American for the British flag on their vessels to assure, if pos-

sible, their safety in waters in which the presence of German submarines is feared. It does not appear that there has been or is any cause for diplomatic remonstrance, however, or other action to stop or to resent this practice. Such use of flags has been common from time immemorial. Our own nation has employed it, using the British flag as a protection against Confederate cruisers during the Civil War; and there is nothing whatever in our laws prohibiting it or penalizing the masters of vessels for resorting to it. As for Great Britain, she has long sanctioned the practice by act of Parliament, penalizing the display of a false flag "excepting when made for the purpose of escaping from an enemy."

The incidents do, however, strongly suggest the desirability of the adoption of some unmistakable and uniform rule upon the subject, in both national and international law. It seems to be one of the matters which have been either voluntarily or involuntarily ignored and left to unwritten law or custom. But unwritten law, which each nation makes for itself, and indeed makes and remakes according to the exigencies of varying circumstances, is one of the most prolific sources of evil. Whether such use of neutral flags in time of war is to be sanctioned or is to be prohibited should be definitely understood.

It must be borne in mind that this practice is radically different from the use of an enemy's flag by a ship of war for purposes of strategy. The latter practice is common. In the present war some of the German cruisers have indulged in it with much success; and it has been common in former wars. The employment of the flag of a neutral nation is an entirely different thing; and there is therefore no pertinence in saying that if a German cruiser could use the Japanese flag for purposes of destruction, a British ship may use the American flag for purposes of salvation. It is, of course, also different from the use of a neutral flag by a warship for belligerent purposes, which would or certainly should be regarded as an intolerable wrong.

It is also to be observed that this practice is not effective against the legitimate stopping, searching, and seizure of ships. In time of war a German cruiser may stop and search a vessel flying the American flag, and may take possession of the vessel as a prize if it be found that it is flying that flag as a ruse, and is in fact an enemy's ship. In such case the responsibility of the act rests upon the vessel making the seizure. Secretary Cass, in Buchanan's administration, laid down the rule, and secured

Great Britain's adherence to it. British vessels were free to stop and search vessels which were suspected of being in the slave-trade, even though they carried the American flag as a disguise; but if they thus stopped a *bona fide* American ship engaged in lawful trade, they would be responsible for the injury.

The present use of this device is intended, therefore, as a safeguard not against being overhauled by a cruiser, but against being summarily torpedoed by a submarine. It is thus provoked by an entirely novel development of naval warfare. The submarine cannot stop, search, and take possession of a ship as a cruiser or battleship could do. It can merely destroy. Granted that it knows a vessel to belong to the enemy, as it does if it sees the enemy's flag flying upon it, it can send a torpedo against it and destroy it out of hand. But if it sees a vessel flying a neutral flag, it can scarcely do that without running the desperate risk of waging war against a neutral power. It has no means of identifying the ship and of making sure whether it is or is not entitled to carry that flag.

We may say frankly that it would be well if this use of neutral flags should serve as an effective restraint upon the operations of submarines against merchant and passenger vessels. It would be regarded as barbarous for ordinary cruisers to go about firing upon and sinking such vessels without giving them the option of surrender, thus destroying not only the vessels but also the lives of multitudes of neutral passengers. We must regard it as no less, but, if possible, still more, barbarous for submarines to do the same thing. For a submarine to attack and destroy a warship, even without warning of its presence, is legitimate. That is a part of the savage game of war. For it to cruise under the high seas, or even in the enemy's waters, sending torpedoes into the hulls of passenger-vessels, is abhorrent to every sentiment save that of a pirate.

~ In such use of neutral flags there is involved, however, a curious contradiction. It is a well-established principle of international law that the merchant-vessels of a belligerent country cannot lawfully be sold or otherwise transferred to a neutral during the war for the sake of escaping the consequences of the war. Yet the pretense of doing that is precisely what this display of a neutral flag effects. It is a pretense that the belligerent's ship has been transferred to the neutral Power—in other words, that an unlawful transaction has been made. A cruiser making the seizure might detect and expose the falsity

of that pretense. The submarine cannot do so, but must either let the vessel go unscathed or run the risk of destroying a vessel which was in good faith neutral property.

The danger of embroiling the neutral Power whose flag is thus used is in any case considerable. It is so great that it would seem to be the part of international comity and prudence to seek a definite agreement upon the matter as soon as the restoration of peace shall make that practicable. It is, of course, a matter of speculation whether the Powers will be inclined to engage in international lawmaking, seeing how flagrantly various such laws and treaties have been violated; though there is reason for hoping that they will be, and that they will promptly seek a settlement of the issues which have been raised in this war. Certainly the United States itself would be competent to register its own convictions and wishes in the matter. Great Britain, as we have said, long ago put herself on statutory record as permitting such use of alien flags by her own citizens, and thus by implication as permitting citizens of other nations to make such use of her flag. The United States might do the same, or it might do the contrary. It should do something about it when the proper time comes, which will be after the end of the war. For it is not well to change the rules of a game while the game is in progress; especially not of the dread game of war.

## NEUTRAL AFFLICTIONS NOW AND A CENTURY AGO

THERE is not a complete analogy—no analogy is ever quite complete—but there is a most interesting and suggestive resemblance between the predicament of the United States and other neutral Powers between the European belligerents to-day, and that of this country between France and Great Britain during the years just before our second war with the latter country. Then, as now, neutrals were made to suffer from the strenuous necessities of belligerents fighting for very life and, in their extremity, regarding the rights and welfare of others as inferior to their own self-preservation.

At that time, in the final struggle between Great Britain and Napoleon Bonaparte, the belligerents were, as to-day, intent upon injuring each other by cutting off supplies of the necessities of life which each was seeking to obtain from neutral countries and chiefly from America. To that end in 1806 Great

Britain proclaimed a blockade of the Continental coast from the Elbe to Brest, though she let it be known that it would be enforced only from Ostend to Havre. Napoleon replied with his Berlin Decree, proclaiming a blockade of the entire British Isles and forbidding *sub pœna* all trade or communication with them—a decree considerably resembling the present German “war zone” order; particularly in this respect, that Napoleon was quite lacking in naval power to make the blockade effective.

Next came a British Order in Council, forbidding all neutral commerce with European ports under Napoleon’s control, or from which British commerce was excluded, with a supplementary Order declaring all such ports to be blockaded, but giving neutral vessels which were warned away from them the privilege of proceeding to some open port, on payment of a fee to the British Government. In reply to this came Napoleon’s Milan Decree, ordering the seizure and confiscation of every neutral vessel which submitted to this Order.

American commerce was thus placed between the devil and the deep sea. An American merchant ship might be overhauled by a British cruiser and searched, quite in accordance with international law, and then be released with an admonition not to try to enter a blockaded port, but to proceed to some open port. In that the American would be committing no offense against France or any one else. Yet because of that episode the vessel would be seized and confiscated by the French. Our vessels must comply with certain British requirements or be seized by the British. Yet if they did comply with them, for that very cause they would be seized and confiscated by the French. In the apt words of Lorenzo Dow’s epigram on predestination:

“You’ll be damned if you do; you’ll be damned if you don’t.”

It was to escape from this embarrassing dilemma that the famous Embargo was ordered, forbidding American merchant vessels to trade with either of the belligerents and thus practically confining them to our domestic waters; whereupon Napoleon cynically ordered the seizure and confiscation of every American ship found anywhere on the seas, out of friendship for the United States and to discourage American ships from breaking the Embargo law!

The next move was made by Great Britain, in offering to repeal the Orders in Council if America would repeal the Non-Intercourse and Embargo acts so far as Great Britain was con-

cerned, while still enforcing them against France. This bargain was not consummated, but the knowledge that it had been considered provoked Napoleon to order the confiscation of every American ship that might enter the ports of France, Spain, Italy, or the Netherlands; an order, however, which was not promulgated. Then Congress repealed the Non-Intercourse act and gave Americans freedom again to trade with both belligerents. But at the same time it invested the President with power to prohibit intercourse with France if Great Britain should before March 3d withdraw the Orders in Council, or with Great Britain if France should annul the Decrees. Neither of those powers took such action, and the act therefore remained a dead letter.

Later in that year Napoleon, fearful of war with America, suggested that he would withdraw the Berlin and Milan Decrees, so far as America was concerned, provided that this country would either get Great Britain to annul her Orders in Council or declare non-intercourse with that country. This tricky offer was, of course, designed either to have the blockade of the French coast removed or to secure America as an ally against Great Britain. Yet at the same time Napoleon ordered the condemnation of all American vessels which had entered French ports, and imposed upon all which should thereafter arrive a vexatious system of license fees and cipher letters with which alone they would be permitted to trade with France. The transparent integrity of Madison apparently made him unable to see through this trick. He accepted Napoleon's offer at its face value, believed that all restrictions upon American commerce with France were removed, and, in default of similar action on the part of Great Britain, proclaimed non-intercourse again with the latter country. That unfortunate error led straight to the War of 1812.

Meantime the British and Danish navies were both busy searching all American vessels which passed into or out of the Baltic Sea, and were seizing and condemning many of them. The spectacle of nearly twoscore of them thus seized and held at Christiansand provoked John Quincy Adams to appeal to the Russian Emperor in behalf of American commerce in those waters, urging him to vindicate the policy of neutral immunity from capture which Catherine the Great had proclaimed during our Revolution. In this appeal Adams was successful, with results of transcendent importance. For Alexander not only ordered Denmark to release all American vessels, which Den-



mark at once did, and welcomed American commerce to the ports of Russia, but he also, chiefly because of this incident, decided to cast his lot against rather than with Napoleon; a decision which assured the latter's ruin, since its sequel was the disastrous march to Moscow.

It is not to be anticipated that any of the present complications over the use of flags, the proclamation of war zones, and what not, will lead to the embroilment of the United States in war, as did those of a century ago. But it is a circumstance worthy of reflection that more than a century and a third after the "Armed Neutrality" and more than a century after the Orders in Council and Berlin and Milan Decrees the rights of neutral commerce in war should still be so uncertain and so precarious.

## THE WAR AND THE WOMAN

MILITARISM has for the time eclipsed Feminism. War news in the press has forced suffrage news into second place. "Relief for Belgium" usurps the prominence of "Votes for Women." Yet there is a reflex influence, so that the very war which for the time obscures the suffrage campaign endows the latter with new arguments and added strength. This, we are told, is a men's war. It is the outcome of men's rule. "*Cherchez la femme*" is not to be said of it. From first to latest it has been void of feminine incitement or intrigue. Had women had the ballot it would never have occurred. Therefore this unequaled calamity to the human race is a stupendous object-lesson in the need of equal suffrage.

That may be; or may not. It is quite true that women cannot be held responsible for this war. It is equally true that they have hitherto been responsible for many wars; proportionately, perhaps, as much as men. History shows feminine rule and feminine influence often to have been belligerent, sometimes wantonly so. It seldom shows them to have been distinctively irenic. It is true, doubtless, that in times past kings were responsible for more wars than queens; but that was for the same reason that Archbishop Whately's white sheep ate more than black ones—because there were more of them.

Certainly the eminent women sovereigns of history have contributed their full share to the warfare of the world. Semiramis of Assyria, and Jingo of Japan, if we go back to semi-

legendary ages, were chiefly famed for their belligerence. Zenobia of Palmyra and Boadicea of Britain were not advocates of "peace at any price." Elizabeth of England, Catherine of Russia, Maria Theresa of Austria and Hungary, Anne of England, Christina and Isabella of Spain, all had reigns marked with many wars. Of even Victoria the Good it was said at her jubilee that there had been a war for every year of her long reign. Nor have non-reigning women always arrayed themselves on the side of peace or of non-resistance. From the time of Miriam and her maidens to the present, women have exulted in the triumphs of battle and have incited their men folk to pugnacity. From Joan of Arc to Molly Pitcher they have, on occasion, taken strenuous lead in actual conflict; for which the world honors them. It has long been notorious that France's Mexican war, resulting in Maximilian's tragedy, was the direct result of the intrigues of Empress Eugénie and "Poor Carlotta." The matrons of Imperial Rome, the women of the Medicis and Bourbons, were never exponents of peaceful humanitarianism. The women of the French Revolution were as bloodthirsty as the men.

Nor does the disposition of women in our own day reverse the record of history. One of the features of our Civil War upon which the whole nation looks with most pride was the way in which the women, both North and South, displayed militant zeal and self-sacrifice, urging their brothers, husbands, sons, and lovers to enlist in the army, and scorning as cowards unworthy of their regard those who would not do so. It was one of the very foremost pioneers of the movements for woman's emancipation who wrote "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." In Europe to-day the same rule holds good. The women of every belligerent land, including many of the foremost suffragists, are urging the men to enlist, and to fight the war out to the bitter end. There is not in history, nor in contemporary observation, any disproof of the poet's saying, that "the female of the species is more deadly than the male." At least in the human species she is fully as militant as he. There is no sex in militarism.

So much for past and present example, to discredit the notion that "votes for women" would instantly abolish war. Let us note also the logic of the case. What could women do, if they had the ballot, to abolish or to prevent war?

We must remember that if equal suffrage everywhere prevailed the women voters would almost certainly be in a mi-

nority. The fact that many women are irreversibly opposed to woman suffrage, and that many who favor it on principle declare that they themselves would not exercise the right, indicates that the proportion of voluntary non-voters would be considerably larger among women than among men; while the number of involuntary non-voters, because of illness, domestic cares, etc., would certainly not be smaller. The two sexes being of about equal numbers, then, the male voters would in all probability form a marked majority; so that if the question of militarism or non-militarism were to be decided by a trial of voting strength between the two sexes, the former would prevail. To say that the votes of the women plus those of the non-militant men would be a majority is to assume that all the women's votes would be against militarism; for which in either history or current conditions there is absolutely no warrant.

We might go further and inquire by what means women, if they had a majority of the votes, would or could prevent war. Two methods are obviously suggested. One is that of refusing appropriations for armies and navies, and thus keeping the country unprepared for war. But the fact is that neither preparedness nor unpreparedness counts greatly either for or against war. Our own history contains two striking demonstrations of that fact. No nation was ever more utterly unprepared for war, more destitute of armaments, than was the United States in 1812; and yet we deliberately began a war of aggression. In 1898, too, our lack of preparation was notorious, and in some respects scandalous; yet that did not restrain us from going to war with Spain. It is not thus that nations are to be kept peaceful or that war is to be prevented.

The other method would be that of making treaties for the maintenance of international peace. But such treaties have been made and have been broken, times out of mind. The present war in Europe was marked in its beginning with the most curt and summary disregard of some of the most solemn conventions ever entered into by sovereign Powers. If they have been broken without compunction, there is only too little reason for hoping that others would be more fortunate.

The fact is, of course, that epigrammatically expressed centuries ago by the world's greatest Teacher. "Man does not live by bread alone." Man is not ruled by governments alone; and the destinies of nations are not determined alone by treaties and conventions. War is not to be ended by royal decree or

by act of Congress. Even the ballot is not a panacea. Universal suffrage for men in America and Europe has not inducted the millennium; and it would be hoping against reason to look for the latter achievement as an immediate result of extending the suffrage to women. Men—the whole human race—must be educated and trained for peace, if that be possible. So long as “man is a fighting animal”—as he is proverbially reputed to be and as indeed he is—so long will he fight, individually and collectively. The hope of peace lies not in laws and treaties, not in systems of government, not in democracies nor despots, but in the hearts and minds of men. Whether the hearts and minds of men can be so transformed as to cause them to turn from the world-old practice of war to abiding peace is a question which nothing but experience can answer.

All this counts, of course, neither for nor against woman suffrage. Doubtless, if that suffrage were known to be an infallible guarantee of peace, the people almost as a unit would be for it. But that it would not be such a guarantee is no condemnation of it. Votes for women are to be granted or withheld on other grounds than that. Also, it would not be well to have this really irrelevant ground employed in any way in this controversy. *Cherchez la femme* is not to be said in considering the causes of this war. Neither is it to be said in devising the ways and means of peace.

## THE BOGY OF ALIEN ILLITERACY

THE President's veto of the Immigration Bill, happily effective, should serve a double purpose. It should put an end to the mistaken effort to debar from this country otherwise acceptable immigrants on the sole ground of illiteracy, and it should lead to a general recognition of the unjust and unreasonable character of that effort. We may unhesitatingly concede that illiteracy is an evil, and that unrestricted immigration is or would be an evil. But the evil of illiteracy is not to be abolished by excluding immigrants who cannot read and write, and the worst evils of promiscuous immigration are not to be corrected by making literacy the test for admission. The illiterates are not, *per se*, the worst class of undesirables. The most serious evil lies in the entrance to this country of wastrels, of degenerates, of the physically and mentally infirm; above all, of the morally corrupt. No rational man should object to

the strictest possible exclusion of these. But there should be no hesitation in preferring an immigrant who is technically illiterate, yet actually intelligent, honest, and industrious, to one who is stupid, dishonest, and lazy, though gifted with all the technical scholarship of the academic curriculum.

It should be borne in mind, too, that illiteracy is not merely an imported thing. It bears the stamp "Made in America," too. Indeed, there is vastly more native than naturalized illiteracy, if we take our whole population into the reckoning; and there is nearly as much native as naturalized if we have regard to only the white race. According to the census of 1910 the numbers of illiterates above the age of ten years were as follows:

Negroes, American born.....	2,227,731
Whites, American born.....	1,534,272
Whites, foreign born.....	1,650,361

Thus there were almost as many white native Americans illiterate as there were illiterate immigrants. True, the proportion of the former to the whole was far less than of the latter. Yet in at least one State the percentage of illiterate native white people was considerably greater than the percentage of illiterate immigrants in the whole country. In Louisiana no fewer than 15 per cent. of the native whites above the age of ten were illiterate, while in the whole United States only 12.7 per cent. of immigrants suffered that disability. Of course, it might be argued that if we have so many illiterates of our own, there is the more cause for excluding those of other lands who seek to come thither. But there would be to this the ready and effective reply that we are sorely disqualified for casting contumelious and condemnatory stones at the unfortunate of other countries.

There is the more force in this latter contention because of the fact that native illiteracy is commonly self-propagating, while alien illiteracy is not. Our native illiterates too often bring up their children as illiterates, while illiterate immigrants do not. That is indeed one of the most impressive circumstances of the whole case. The average native illiterate is the child of an illiterate. But the illiterate immigrant almost invariably takes pains to have his children educated. The result is that the children of immigrants are the most generally literate class of our entire population. Here are the percentages of illiteracy among adults in 1910:

Negroes, American born.....	30.4
Whites, foreign born .....	12.7
Whites, American born of American parents. ....	3.7
Whites, American born of immigrant parents.....	1.1

Thus the illiterate children of immigrants were less than one-third as many, proportionately, as the illiterate children of native Americans. What is the natural and inevitable deduction? Why, that illiterate immigration, while a present evil, assures a much greater future good. It increases for the present the sum total of illiteracy in the nation, but promises in the next generation to decrease its proportion. It means a present generation of illiterates, but a coming generation of literates.

There is the less reason for applying the literacy restriction to immigration at this time, because for some years to come the volume of aliens entering this country is practically certain to be greatly diminished as a result of the European war. While the war lasts there will be few immigrants. Some who would otherwise have come will not come because they cannot get passage, in the great disturbance of ocean traffic; some because they are in the armies or were in the armies and have been killed; some because they expect soon to be needed in the armies; some because they are urgently needed to carry on the industries the ranks of whose workers have been depleted by the military conscription.

So much while the war lasts. But with the return of peace we need look for no marked resumption of migration to America. The enormous losses of the war will have decreased the industrial efficiency of the chief European nations so greatly that all the survivors will be needed at home, and will in fact have at home greater opportunities of achievement and of gain than they would have here. Nor will the need be for men merely to man the ordinary industries. The devastation of the war will enormously increase the amount of work that is to be done. The lands in which the war has raged will need all their own citizens, and all who can be spared by their neighbors, to rebuild their razed cities, to till their ravaged fields, and to rehabilitate their prostrated industries. They will have no workers to spare for America.

It is not to be expected that any considerable number will desert their stricken fatherlands and come hither; though for our own good we might selfishly wish that they might do so. In former ages such migrations did occur; sometimes with results of amazing beneficence to the lands which gave asylum

to the exiles. The famous linen industry of Ireland, though it had long before existed, was enormously increased and raised to its greatest efficiency and prosperity by the influx of skilled workmen from Belgium. More notable, because more numerous, was the similar movement of French exiles. From 1684 to 1691, following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the very flower of the French nation migrated to other lands. Great industries were ruined, never to rise again in France, though some of them did rise elsewhere. The Norman hat trade, formerly the greatest in Europe, disappeared. Three-fourths of the silk-workers of Lyons and Touraine went into exile, to re-establish their industry at Spitalfield, England, and in Holland. French refugees settled by thousands in Brandenburg and in Berlin, more than doubling the population of that city and starting it upon its way to greatness. Some came to America, and still others, led by the nephew of Duquesne, settled at the Cape of Good Hope and laid the foundations of civilization in South Africa.

Much as we might welcome the Belgians, however, there will be no such exodus after this war, any more than there was from France in 1871. Some will be constrained by patriotism to remain at home; some will be restrained by their Governments; some will remain in the expectation that there will be greater profit there than here, as there well may be. The spirit now shown by the whole Belgian nation, from King Albert down, indicates that the "*fortissimi*" of Cæsar's time will find worthy descendants in our own day, and that not even this latest and worst of the conflicts which during so many centuries have raged in that "cockpit of Europe" will cause Belgium to be deserted by the surviving remnant of her people.

We may, therefore, prudently assume that for a number of years we shall receive so few immigrants that the minor percentage of illiteracy among them will be a negligible quantity, particularly if we adopt and enforce suitable restrictions based upon grounds of character and efficiency. It is for his own criminality or economic worthlessness that the alien should be penalized, and not for the deprivation which he has suffered unwillingly at the hands of the Government from which he is seeking to escape to better things.